THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT TEACHING ON THE EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

A Field Report

Presented to

The School of Graduate Studies

Drake University

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science in Education

---

by

Barbara C. Poehlein

August 1969

THE EFFECTS OF STUDENT TEACHING ON THE EDUCATIONAL ATTITUDES OF PROSPECTIVE TEACHERS

by

Barbara C. Poehlein

Approved by Committee:

Robert L. Evans
Chairman

Ralph H Wagner

Earle L. Canfield
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Colleges and universities concerned with teacher education are constantly seeking alternative programs and procedures which will help prepare qualified teachers for work in the educational field. Continual evaluation is needed to help appraise the effectiveness of the programs being used. One aspect that should be investigated is the effect of these programs on the educational attitudes of prospective teachers.

I. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. It was the purpose of this study to (1) determine the effect of a semester of student teaching experience on the attitudes of elementary student teachers in the College of Education at Drake University; (2) inspect the direction of change of the student teachers' attitudes; and (3) compare the changes in attitudes of students teaching in teams to those of students teaching individually.

Importance of the study. The student teaching experience has frequently been stressed as one of the most valuable parts of pre-service teacher training. Student

teachers enter their student teaching experience with underlying attitudes concerning educational philosophy and relationships with adults and pupils in the school setting.[1] During the student teaching period pre-service teachers should have the opportunity to develop further understandings, skills and attitudes which will prepare them for effective classroom teaching. The effect of the student teaching experience on these attitudes has been examined by several researchers. Few of these studies, however, related their results to alternative types of student teaching programs as discussed herein.[2]

This study examined the effects of two alternative student-teaching programs provided for the elementary education students at Drake University. The first program was composed of student teachers who worked with a cooperating teacher on a one-to-one ratio for one semester. The second program, initiated in the spring of 1968, consisted of teams of student teachers working with one cooperating teacher. No previous study has appraised this aspect of the team teaching program.

---

[1] Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960), p. 31.

[2] Margaret Lindsey, Leslie Mauth, and Edith Grotberg, Improving Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education (New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959), p. 18.

Limitations of the study. The major limitations of this study related to (1) the limited number of cases used, (2) the problems of validity inherent to the direct-inquiry method, (3) the purposes for which the instrument used was designed, and (4) the qualification requirements established for team student teachers and cooperating teachers.

The number of cases, N=38, was established by the number of students enrolled in elementary student teaching for the spring semester of 1969. To provide a larger sample it would have been necessary to continue the study for several semesters.

According to Ryans there has been no better method developed than direct questioning in order to obtain information about teacher attitudes.[1] In using the direct-inquiry method, however, Ryans recognized some inherent weaknesses.

> The basic assumptions (and possible weaknesses) of direct-inquiry methods are that the responding individual is (1) able to understand the questions put to him and to provide the required judgments or information, and (2) willing to reveal the responses which, in his own case, seem to be either correct or the best answers to the questions.[2]

The questionnaire administered in this study was carefully evaluated in terms of the clarity of items and directions

---

[1]David G. Ryans, Characteristics of Teachers (Washington: American Council on Education, 1960), pp. 137-138.

[2]Ibid.

for administration in order to provide as reliable an instrument as possible.

The instrument was designed by Dr. R. L. Evans to assess attitudes or present opinion on statements about teaching, not to measure cause and effect relationships.[1] The author of the test stated:

> There was no pretense of saying that these items were ideas or concepts that a teacher should or must know. Thus no attempt was made to imply correctness on a response. . . . Emphasis was on the assessment of student teaching as a dynamic factor in an attitude changing process. Cause and effect relationships in change cannot be measured in this study and are beyond the scope of the instrument and investigation.[2]

The instrument was validated on the basis of an analysis of content validity. Content validity is the extent to which the items included in a test are representative of the situations being sampled. In most cases the content of the test items is compared with the content of the curriculum and the objectives of the learning experience. Content validity cannot be measured quantitatively and therefore cannot be established statistically.[3] The Evans' Attitude Survey was validated by comparing the content of the items

---

[1] Robert L. Evans, "Concept and Attitude Change in Student Teachers" (Des Moines, Iowa: Drake University, 1966), p. 1. (Mimeographed.)

[2] Ibid.

[3] Robert M. W. Travers, An Introduction to Educational Research (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958), p. 155.

to the educational attitudes which would be encountered in the student teaching experience.

In planning the team teaching program for student teachers it was determined that the students who participated would need to meet certain requirements. Each student had indicated a desire to participate and had to be approved by A Drake University professor who had observed the student's previous work in teacher training activities. The cooperating teachers were selected in like manner. The students and cooperating teachers, therefore, had already indicated certain attitudes by their previous acceptance of professional responsibilities and by expressing a desire to participate in the team teaching program.

II. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Educational attitudes. Educational attitudes were interpreted as underlying values which influence the student teacher's behavior. These values determine the student teacher's feelings toward himself and others. They influence "his perception of teaching as a career, his personal goals and values, his perception of children and learning, and his concept of himself as a teacher."[1]

---

[1]Haines, op. cit., p. 138.

Cooperating teachers. The cooperating teachers involved in this study were regularly employed, experienced teachers in Iowa public schools. During the student teaching semester these teachers provided guidance for student teachers as they gained practical experience in classroom teaching. The cooperating teacher is referred to as a "supervising teacher" in some educational literature.

Individual student teachers. The term individual student teachers refers to those students who were placed under the guidance of a cooperating teacher on the basis of one student teacher per classroom. All planning and evaluation of classroom activities were performed cooperatively by the individual student teacher and cooperating teacher.

Team student teachers. In this study the term team student teachers refers to groups of four student teachers who worked with one cooperating teacher in diagnosing and planning a program for one elementary classroom. These student teaching teams were designed to provide opportunities for student teachers to experience the benefits of group planning and evaluation.

Standard deviation. Standard deviation (S.D.) is a measure of variability which indicates how closely the measured scores of a population gather around the mean score.

For example, a S.D. of five would indicate that 68 per cent of the measured population achieved scores within a range from the mean minus five to the mean plus five.[1]

---

[1] N. M. Downie and R. W. Heath, Basic Statistical Methods (New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959), pp. 44-47.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A review of the literature showed several studies concerning the attitudes of prospective teachers during pre-service training. Most of these studies dealt with changes in student teacher attitudes in relationship to cooperating teacher attitudes or the direction of attitudinal changes. In this chapter are presented studies concerning the attitudinal changes of student teachers and the use of team teaching in teacher education.

I. REVIEW OF RELATED STUDIES OF STUDENT TEACHER ATTITUDES

Stratemeyer has suggested that prospective teachers have great differences in their feelings toward themselves, their role in the educational field and the place of education in today's society.[1] These feelings, or values were considered by Haines to be "directional goals" rather than static goals.[2] Studies on student teacher attitudes differ

---

[1]Florence Stratemeyer, "Individual Differences in Student Teaching: A Summing Up and a Look Ahead," Readings in Student Teaching for Those Who Work with Student Teachers, Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, editors (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Book Company, 1967), p. 349.

[2]Aleyne Clayton Haines, Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960), p. 16.

in the degree and direction of attitudinal change indicated. No difference in the consistency of educational ideas following student teaching was shown in Newsome's study, however.[1]

Many researchers have incorporated the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory into their research on student teacher attitude changes. Price used the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) to investigate the relationship of student teacher's attitudinal changes to the attitudes held by their cooperating teachers. His findings indicated a definite change in student teacher's attitudes during the student teaching semester and a tendency for student teacher's attitudes to change in the direction of attitudes held by the supervising teachers. Even though these relationships were shown, Price found that "closer inspection of the attitude scores showed that the findings were not entirely true when considered on an individual basis."[2] A study reported by Lipscomb also showed that student teachers

---

[1]George L. Newsome Jr., Harold W. Gentry and Lester D. Stephens, "Changes in Consistency of Educational Ideas Attributable to Student-Teaching Experiences," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 319-323.

[2]Robert D. Price, "The Influence of Supervising Teachers," Readings in Student Teaching for Those Who Work with Student Teachers, Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, editors (Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Book Company, 1967), p. 261.

tended to develop similar attitudes as those expressed by cooperating teachers.[1]

An earlier study by Evans used the same instrument employed in this study. Evans administered this survey to a group of Drake University student teachers before student teaching and again at the end of their classroom training experience. A group from the Drake University Elementary Education staff and a small group of cooperating teachers involved in the Drake University student teaching program were also surveyed. The results of this study showed that the student teachers in this group did not indicate much change in their responses nor did their responses become more like those of the cooperating teachers surveyed.[2] The lack of significant change found in this study has also been reported in some of the research conducted with other attitude instruments. The lack of relationship between student teacher and cooperating teacher attitudes shown in Evans' study did not, however, agree with the findings of Price and Lipscomb.

---

[1] Edra E. Lipscomb, "A Study of the Attitudes of Student Teachers in Elementary Education As Related to Attitudes of Cooperating Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 351-352.

[2] Robert L. Evans, "Concept and Attitude Change in Student Teachers" (Des Moines, Iowa: Drake University, 1966), pp. 1-8. (Mimeographed.)

Callis' research with the Teacher Attitude Inventory, a forerunner of the MTAI, indicated that attitudes measured by the Inventory were influenced only slightly by student teaching experience.[1] Another study using the MTAI was reported by Dutton. Dutton related student teacher's attitude changes to their anxiety levels as assessed by the Taylor Manifest Anxiety Scale and Anxiety Differential. The attitude changes and anxiety levels of ninety-one student teachers were compared to those of 150 non-student teachers. The non-student teaching group maintained high positive attitudes toward children throughout the semester. The student teacher group, however, indicated that "both highly anxious and nonanxious elementary school student teachers changed their attitudes toward youth in a negative direction."[2]

Another study showing negative change during student teaching, mean loss of 4.2, was reported by Day. Also incorporated in Day's research was a follow-up survey which

---

[1]Robert Callis, "Change in Teacher-Pupil Attitudes Related to Training and Experience," Educational and Psychological Measurement, X (Winter, 1950), 727.

[2]Wilbur H. Dutton, "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers and Anxiety," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (May, 1962), 380-382.

assessed teacher attitudes one year later following employment. A severe shift, mean loss 20.0, in the direction of less desirable attitudes was found to have occurred during the first six months of school employment. Meanwhile, the students who did not enter teaching showed very little change, mean loss 1.5, in their attitudes.[1]

While studies such as Callis' reported no significant differences in attitude changes, the studies of Dutton and Day reported significant attitude changes. The discrepancy between these related studies was considered by Campbell in his analysis of "Dimensional Attitude Changes of Student Teachers."[2] Although Campbell found no significant differences in MTAI attitude scores as a result of student teaching, he did find that attitude responses differed significantly in the five dimensions of the inventory. Therefore, Campbell stated:

> . . . when the five areas included within the MTAI are considered as dimensions rather than as part of the whole, this study would tend to agree with the second group [Dutton and Day's studies] for a significant difference between the dimensions was discernible even though the dimension did not vary with the treatment. When the dimensions were considered by the Sign Test,

---

[1]Harry P. Day, "Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers after Initial Teaching Experience," Journal of Teacher Education, X (September, 1959), 326.

[2]Donald E. Campbell, "Dimensional Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (December, 1967), 162.

> a significant shift in one of the dimensional attitudes was noted. Perhaps a better understanding of attitude changes resulting from experimental conditions may be more appropriately evaluated by inspecting the dimensions of the attitude changes.[1]

Corrigan and Griswold constructed an attitude inventory consisting of eighty items which related to three fundamental educational principles. The group of student teachers tested showed a mean attitude change of +9.8 which was determined to be statistically significant. In their analysis of the findings Corrigan and Griswold presented these apparent relationships:

1. The college supervisors and seminar activities were influential in causing change.
2. The students working with "superior" rated cooperating teachers showed smaller positive mean attitude change than those students working with "average" rated cooperating teachers.
3. Lower elementary grade level student teachers scored higher positive attitude scores on the pre-test and also a higher mean attitude change.[2]

Another study showing significant change in student teacher attitudes was reported by Hoy. The attitudes investigated in this study related to pupil control ideology and were conceptualized along a continuum which ranged from "custodialism" at one extreme and "humanism" at the other.

---

[1] Ibid.

[2] Dean Corrigan and Kenneth Griswold, "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LVII (October, 1963), 93-95.

The instrument, the Pupil Control Ideology form, was administered both before and after student teaching. The hypothesis that student teachers would be significantly more "custodial" in their pupil control ideology after student teaching experience than before was confirmed at a level of significance beyond the .001 level.[1]

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ON THE USE OF TEAM TEACHING IN TEACHER EDUCATION

The use of team teaching in student teacher training programs has received very little attention or study in educational literature. For the purposes of this study the author surveyed information concerning team teaching in the elementary school and literature which reported student teaching programs which have seemed to adopt a team, or group approach.

During the past decade there has been a significant increase in the interest in and utilization of the team-teaching concept. Although the roots of team-teaching have been traced far back in history, the present cooperative teaching programs incorporate procedures and philosophies which are in the early stages of development. Moreover, no

---

[1]Wayne K. Hoy, "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology," The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (December, 1967), 153-155.

commonly accepted definition of team teaching has been developed.[1]

In their examination of team-teaching programs Bair and Woodward suggested that because team-teaching is an evolving program it must not be defined too rigidly.[2] Therefore, these authors adhered to the following definition presented by Dean and Witherspoon:

> The heart and concept of team teaching lies not in details of structure and organization but more in the essential spirit of cooperative planning, constant collaboration, close unity, unrestrained communication, and sincere sharing. It is reflected not in a group of individuals articulating together but rather in a group which is a single, unified team. Inherent in the plan is an increased degree of flexibility for teacher responsibility, grouping policies and practices, and size of groups, and an invigorating spirit of freedom and opportunity to revamp programs to meet educational needs of children.[3]

Several direct and indirect benefits of team-teaching programs were pointed out by Bair and Woodward:

1. The superiority of plans and procedures developed by a team of teachers over those utilized by single teachers.
2. The development of quality teaching through cooperative observation and evaluation with team teachers.
3. The excellent teacher-training opportunities provided.

---

[1]Medill Bair and Richard G. Woodward, Team Teaching in Action (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964), p. 12.

[2]Ibid., p. 21.

[3]Ibid., p. 22.

4. The development of supervisory capabilities in team members as a result of group leadership opportunities.
5. The freedom allowed to teachers for planning, conferences and other professional activities due to the teacher aides' assumption of non-professional duties.[1]

In relation to the third benefit mentioned on the preceding page Bair and Woodward referred to a program undertaken at the University of Wisconsin. This program provided an opportunity for university students in their last stages of teacher training to participate as full-time members of a public school team. Graduate internship programs in other universities have also provided similar opportunities for teacher trainees.[2]

A student teaching program presently used at Drake University incorporates a team-teaching program for undergraduate student teachers in elementary education. In describing the Drake University program Dr. R. L. Evans stated:

> This effort allows four student teachers to work as a team in a single public school elementary classroom. . . . There is no particular pattern for their operation, only an injunction that many organizationsl and teaching patterns may be used.[3]

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 12-15.

[2] Ibid., p. 14.

[3] Robert L. Evans, "Student Teacher Teams" (Des Moines, Iowa: Drake University, 1968), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

The student teaching teams in this program provided benefits to both student teachers and the public school classrooms. Student teachers had the opportunity to share ideas and experiences through team planning and evaluation. Moreover, a wider variety of learning experiences could be provided for pupils because of the shared planning and team participation.[1]

In the literature presented in the second part of this chapter the author has attempted to survey some of the available information on the characteristics and purposes of team teaching programs. Unfortunately the research in this area, particularly student teaching teams, is lacking. Hopefully, more study of student teaching teams will be attempted in order to evaluate this alternative student teaching program.

---

[1] Ibid., p. 3.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY

One important purpose of the student teaching experience is to provide an opportunity for student teachers to redefine their educational attitudes in relation to their "practical" or classroom experience. To investigate the changes in student teacher attitudes during the student teaching experience, scores on an attitude survey administered at the beginning and end of the student teaching experience were compared.

I. PROCEDURE

The group used for this study consisted of elementary education students who participated in the student teaching program at Drake University during the spring semester of 1969. The group was composed of thirty-eight members, twenty of whom participated in student teaching teams and eighteen who were individual student teachers. This figure did not include one student teacher who worked both as an individual student teacher and a team student teacher during the semester.

An attitude survey developed by Dr. R. L. Evans (see Appendix) was administered to the group of thirty-eight before

the student teaching semester and again at the end of the semester. The students completed the attitude survey in group seminars under the supervision of the Drake seminar professors.

In responding to the items on the survey students were asked to check one of six categories according to their present opinion toward each of the items. For ease of handling, each category was given a numerical weight value. The six categories and their respective numerical weights are shown in Table I.

TABLE I

NUMERICAL WEIGHT VALUES ASSIGNED TO RESPONSE CATEGORIES OF EVANS' ATTITUDE SURVEY

Response Categories	Weight Values
Generally agree with statement	1
Agree with slight reservation	2
Agree, with conditions	3
Reject in some part	4
Reject for the most part	5
Reject statement generally	6

The surveys were scored by adding the weights of the responses for all of the items. The resulting sum was the total weighted score. The pre-test and post test total weighted scores were recorded for each student teacher. The net change, the difference between pre-test and post test scores, was also listed for each student. The net change was the simple difference between the scores, irrespective of the direction of change. The gross change was found for each group by adding the net changes of the individuals in that group. The average net change for each group was then found by dividing the gross change by the number of subjects within the group.

The total weighted scores for the pre-tests and post tests were added for each group. These four sums were then divided by the number of subjects in the respective groups to find the average weighted score of the pre-test and post test of each group. The difference between the average weighted pre-test and post test scores was called the group change.

A final statistical analysis involved the determination of the range of scores and the variance of scores on the pre-test and post test of both groups. The range was computed by subtracting the lowest score from the highest score. The measure of variance was attained by the computation of the standard deviation (S.D.).

Further analysis of the differences between the two groups was made by a description of the groups' responses to individual items. Selected items showing significantly different responses will be discussed in the context of the presentation of the data.

II. RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The results of the survey were analyzed by inspecting the total scores and responses to individual items. The analysis of these two sets of data are presented separately.

Analysis of total scores. The team student teachers scored higher average weighted scores on both the pre-test and post test than did the individual student teachers, as can be seen in Table II. The change from pre-test to post test average weighted scores for team student teachers was 3.0. This was considerably higher than the change for the individual student teachers which was .8. In contrast, however, the average net change for the individual student teacher group was 1.18 higher than for the team student teacher group.

The measure of variability illustrated further differences between the team and individual student teacher groups. The pre-test standard deviation (S.D.) for the team student teachers, which was the larger group, was .27 smaller than the pre-test S.D. for the individual student teacher group.

TABLE II

TOTAL WEIGHTED SCORES AND SCORE CHANGES FOR TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TEACHER GROUPS

Individual Student Teachers				Team Student Teachers			
Case Number	Weighted Pre-test Score	Weighted Post Score	Net Change	Case Number	Weighted Pre-test Score	Weighted Post Score	Net Change
1	195	193	2	1	205.5	208	2.5
2	204	222	18	2	205	195	10
3	194	187	7	3	223	217	6
4	210	229	19	4	195	200	5
5	225	210.5	14.5	5	194	177	17
6	176	185	9	6	192	200	8
7	208	190	18	7	204.5	202	2.5
8	201	191	10	8	192	183	9
9	190	186	4	9	223.5	208.5	15
10	222	207.5	14.5	10	179	192	13
11	169	177	8	11	202	177	25
12	195	203	8	12	174	176	2
13	193	171	22	13	246	240	6
14	168	167	1	14	190	191	1
15	173	186	7	15	207	212	5
16	148	157	9	16	203	196	7
17	169	164	5	17	188	176	12
18	192	192	0	18	186	196	10
				19	181	175	6
				20	167	177	10
Totals	3432	3418	176		3957.5	3898.5	172
Means	190.7	189.9	9.78		197.9	194.9	8.60
Standard Deviations	7.47	7.21			7.20	6.25	

The team student teacher group became much more cohesive as indicated by a reduction in the S.D. of .95 from the pre-test to the post test. The individual student teaching group also became more cohesive, but to a much lesser degree, .26. The individual group, even though smaller, never became as cohesive as the team group had been in the beginning. Two scattergrams, one for each of the groups, illustrated an increased degree of cohesiveness of the team student teacher group.

Analysis of individual items. An analysis of the responses revealed that on eighteen of the fifty-five items there were noticeable differences between the responses of the team student teachers and the individual student teachers. These items and the responses are shown in Table III. In the table are listed the acceptance and rejection responses for both testings of each student teacher group. The over-all changes indicated in Table III do not necessarily reflect the varied responses of all individuals.

In four of the items, numbers 1, 7, 45 and 53, the team student teachers showed a gain in acceptance and the individual student teachers gained in rejection. Conversely, on item 12 the team student teachers gained in rejection while the individual student teachers gained in acceptance. The responses to item 32 indicated that the team student

TABLE III

SELECTED ITEMS AND RESPONSES FOR TEAM AND INDIVIDUAL STUDENT TEACHER GROUPS ON EVANS' ATTITUDE SURVEY

Selected Items	Student Teachers			
	Individual		Team	
	Pre-test A R	Post test A R	Pre-test A R	Post test A R
1. Teaching is an art, definitely not a science.	10-7	9-8	11-8	13-6
2. Elementary teachers should be masters of the subject matters they teach.	12-6	12-6	10-10	9-11
4. Student teaching is the only real training for teaching.	9-9	9-9	11-9	13-7
6. The major purpose of teaching is to convey subject matter.	5-13	5-13	3-17	1-19
7. Teachers find little use for theory in the classroom.	4-14	2-16	4-16	7-13
12. Research should be left to college teachers.	2-16	4-14	2-18	0-20
13. Ethically one teacher should not criticize another teacher's teaching.	10-8	10-8	4-16	10-10
16. Age makes teachers rigid and traditional.	1-17	0-18	3-17	4-16
20. Women make better elementary teachers than men.	1-17	1-17	5-15	4-16
25. A charming personality is the best quality for any teacher.	10-7	9-8	14-6	9-11

TABLE III (Continued)

Selected Items	Student Teachers			
	Individual		Team	
	Pre-test A R	Post test A R	Pre-test A R	Post test A R
32. Each teacher should establish a routine and stick to it.	7-11	11-7	7-12	15-4
39. Teachers have a duty to see that pupils learn subject matter with or without interest.	2-16	7-11	3-17	3-17
44. The teacher's job is to run a smooth, quiet, calm classroom.	6-12	3-15	1-19	2-18
45. The efficient teacher covers all required text material.	8-10	5-13	2-18	6-14
46. Pupils learn in spite of what the teacher does.	8-10	6-12	12-8	12-8
48. Inability to control a class is the chief reason for failure in teaching.	11-7	10-8	11-9	17-3
53. The really successful teacher gains the respect and love of all pupils.	13-5	11-7	15-5	16-4
54. Imagination and creativity in children is best fostered by teachers who have these traits.	15-3	15-3	15-5	13-7

teachers and individual student teachers both gained in acceptance, but the latter group to a noticeably lesser degree.

The team student teachers gained in rejection while the individual student teachers maintained the same position on items 6, 20, 25 and 54. The individual student teachers continued to maintain their positions while the team student teachers gained in acceptance on items 4, 13, 16 and 48.

The team student teachers maintained the same position on only three items, 39, 44 and 46. On the first of these the individual student teachers gained in acceptance and on the other two showed a gain in rejection.

On item two the responses indicated little movement but the positions held by the two groups were markedly different.

The two groups differed noticeably on the total number of changes on the selected items in Table III. The team student teachers accounted for a total of forty-seven changes while the individual student teachers made only twenty-seven changes.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study of attitudinal changes of student teachers was made to determine the effect of a semester of student teaching experience on the attitudes of elementary student teachers. The direction of change was inspected and a comparison of changes in attitudes of students teaching in teams to those of students teaching individually was made.

I. SUMMARY

The student teacher attitude survey developed by Dr. R. L. Evans was administered to thirty-eight Drake University elementary education students at the beginning and end of their student teaching semesters. Of these thirty-eight students, eighteen taught as individual student teachers and the remaining twenty taught on student teaching teams. The results of the survey were analyzed to determine if there was any change in the educational attitudes of either or both groups.

The members of both student teacher groups averaged thirty changes on the fifty-five items. Even though the average rate of change for the two groups was very similar, closer inspection revealed that there were marked differences in items in which the changes occurred. On the selected

items where marked change did occur the team student teachers accounted for the bulk of those changes. The team student teachers also showed a greater tendency to gain group cohesiveness as shown by the standard deviation measure of variance. The changes that occurred between and within the groups were not statistically significant.

II. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of this study the following conclusions were made.

1. The results of the attitude survey administrations did not show a significant change of attitudes for elementary education students due to the student teaching experience.
2. The team student teacher group showed more of a tendency to develop similar attitudes as a group than did the individual student teachers.
3. The changes that occurred between the groups were not statistically significant but it was apparent to the writer that the degree of change tended to be greater for the team teacher group.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

On the basis of the conclusions from this study the following recommendations are presented:

1. Additional studies should be conducted using other methods or instruments in order to establish significance for the trends in attitudinal change revealed in this study.
2. The attitude survey used in this study should be further developed to measure positive and negative directional changes of educational attitudes.
3. The team student teaching approach to teacher education should be continued and further evaluated in terms of the educational attitudes it is designed to foster.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bair, Medill, and Richard G. Woodward. Team Teaching in Action. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1964.

Downie, N. M., and R. W. Heath. Basic Statistical Methods. New York: Harper and Brothers, Publishers, 1959.

Haines, Aleyne Clayton. Guiding the Student Teaching Process in Elementary Education. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1960.

Lindsey, Margaret, Leslie Mauth, and Edith Grotberg. Improving Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education. New York: Bureau of Publications Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959.

Ryans, David G. Characteristics of Teachers. Washington: American Council on Education, 1960.

Travers, Robert M. W. An Introduction to Educational Research. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1958.

B. PERIODICALS

Callis, Robert. "Change in Teacher-Pupil Attitudes Related to Training and Experience," Educational and Psychological Measurement, X (Winter, 1950), 718-727.

Campbell, Donald E. "Dimensional Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (December, 1967), 160-162.

Corrigan, Dean and Kenneth Griswold. "Attitude Changes of Student Teachers," The Journal of Educational Research, LVII (October, 1963), 93-95.

Day, Harry P. "Attitude Changes of Beginning Teachers after Initial Teaching Experience," Journal of Teacher Education, X (September, 1959), 326-328.

Dutton, Wilbur H. "Attitude Change of Elementary School Student Teachers and Anxiety," The Journal of Educational Research, LV (May, 1962), 380-382.

Hoy, Wayne K. "Organizational Socialization: The Student Teacher and Pupil Control Ideology," The Journal of Educational Research, LXI (December, 1967), 153-155.

Lipscomb, Edra E. "A Study of the Attitudes of Student Teachers in Elementary Education as Related to Attitudes of Cooperating Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 351-352.

Newsome, George L. Jr., Harold W. Gentry and Lester D. Stephens. "Changes in Consistency of Educational Ideas Attributable to Student-Teaching Experiences," Journal of Teacher Education, XVI (September, 1965), 319-323.

C. ARTICLES IN COLLECTIONS

Price, Robert D. "The Influence of Supervising Teachers," Readings in Student Teaching for Those Who Work with Student Teachers, Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, editors. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Book Company, 1967. 256-261.

Stratemeyer, Florence. "Individual Differences in Student Teaching: A Summing Up and a Look Ahead," Readings in Student Teaching for Those Who Work with Student Teachers, Jim Johnson and Floyd Perry, editors. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Book Company, 1967. 344-352.

D. UNPUBLISHED MATERIALS

Evans, Robert L. "Concept and Attitude Change in Student Teachers." Des Moines, Iowa: Drake University, 1966. (Mimeographed.)

_____. "Student Teacher Teams." Des Moines, Iowa: Drake University, 1968. (Mimeographed.)

APPENDIX

APPENDIX

LETTER TO STUDENT TEACHERS

February 17, 1969

Dear _____:

In conjunction with my field report for my Masters of Science in Education I would like to ask your help. I am evaluating the present attitudes toward teaching held by those students who are beginning their student teaching program. It is the purpose of this study to determine changes in attitudes of student teachers during the semester of student teaching. Therefore, I will be asking you to administer a post test also. This scale, which Dr. Evans has devised, consists of fifty-five items to which the student will respond according to his level of acceptance or rejection. Dr. Evans has suggested that the test be administered as a part of the seminar program.

In administering the scale please ask the students to fill in all background information and be sure to respond to all items.

Your cooperation in administering this scale is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

Barbara C. Poehlein

APPENDIX

EVANS' ATTITUDE SURVEY

Date _____

Name _____ Age _____ Sex _____

Teaching Experience (not including student teaching)

_____
Number of Semesters

Members of your immediate family who have taught _____

_____

Student teaching experience:

School _____ Grade _____

Drake Supervisor _____

Supervising Teacher _____

Previous student teaching experience: Yes ____ No ____.

If yes, how many semesters? _____

Answer each item by checking (X or V) in the appropriate row and column. There are no right or wrong items. The scale seeks to assess attitudes or present opinion on the items. The scale runs from (1) generally accept to (6) generally reject and indicates the strength and direction of your present opinion, feeling and attitude.

Levels of Acceptance		Levels of Rejection	
	1. Generally agree with statement		4. Reject in some part
	2. Agree with slight reservation		5. Reject for the most part
	3. Agree, with conditions		6. Reject statement generally

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Teaching is an art, definitely not a science.						

		1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Elementary teachers should be masters of the subject matter they teach.						
3.	Teachers are born not made.						
4.	Student teaching is the only real training for teaching.						
5.	Pupils learn best when only praise is given them.						
6.	The major purpose of teaching is to convey subject matter.						
7.	Teachers find little use for theory in the classroom.						
8.	A teacher who experiments with the curriculum is asking for trouble.						
9.	Achievement test gains by pupils show which teachers are the best.						
10.	Pupils must like their teachers to do their best work.						
11.	Most elementary teachers have few decisions to make in classroom teaching.						
12.	Research should be left to college teachers.						
13.	Ethically one teacher should not criticize another teacher's teaching.						
14.	The greatest asset of any teacher is intelligence.						
15.	Marriage interferes with teaching ability.						
16.	Age makes teachers rigid and traditional.						

		1	2	3	4	5	6
17.	The best teaching is done by young, energetic teachers.						
18.	The friendly teacher is a good teacher.						
19.	It takes more intelligence to teach high school math and physics than to teach third grade.						
20.	Women make better elementary teachers than men.						
21.	Teachers should deliberately frustrate pupils' learning.						
22.	A teacher that smokes and drinks cannot have a good influence on pupils.						
23.	Pupils of any age or grade can be taught anything, anytime if it is on an appropriate level.						
24.	Consistency is the key to discipline.						
25.	A charming personality is the best quality for any teacher.						
26.	A teacher must be part actor, scientist, scholar, personality, mother and policeman.						
27.	Teaching requires a critical mind.						
28.	The dissatisfactions of teachers lead to progress in education.						
29.	Many persons prefer teaching because they have power over younger ones.						
30.	Good questions lead to learning.						
31.	Elementary teachers teach children while high school teachers teach subject matter.						

		1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	Each teacher should establish a routine and stick to it.						
33.	A teacher should be confident that his methodology is correct.						
34.	A non-conformist has no place in the elementary school classroom.						
35.	Creativity is a sign of intelligence.						
36.	Small group work is the modern way to teach.						
37.	A good teacher considers the textbook as the voice of an expert authority.						
38.	A teacher has no greater concern than children's interests.						
39.	Teachers have a duty to see that pupils learn subject matter with or without interest.						
40.	Teaching when pupils want to learn something is the time to teach.						
41.	Pupils do not learn when punished by the teacher.						
42.	Teachers as well as pupils must have specific purposes when handling curricula to be learned.						
43.	The teacher takes care of individual differences by grouping children according to ability.						
44.	The teacher's job is to run a smooth, quiet, calm classroom.						

		1	2	3	4	5	6
45.	The efficient teacher covers all required text material.						
46.	Pupils learn in spite of what the teacher does.						
47.	Elementary teachers teach primarily by verbal methods.						
48.	Inability to control a class is the chief reason for failure in teaching.						
49.	Challenging pupils up to the frustration point is fine educational motivation.						
50.	To teach critical thinking, the teacher must know how to think critically.						
51.	A variety of teaching techniques is the elementary teacher's most valuable asset.						
52.	Evaluation of teaching ability is best seen in changes in pupil behavior.						
53.	The really successful teacher gains the respect and love of all pupils.						
54.	Imagination and creativity in children is best fostered by teachers who have these traits.						
55.	It is necessary for the elementary teacher to be a good public speaker.						